

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on September 23, 2008, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 2, 10, and 16 have been amended for clarification and claim 17 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amended claims may be at least in canceled claim 17. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banerjee et al. (US 2007/0156394, hereinafter “Banerjee”) in view of Robertson et al. (US 2006/0277213, hereinafter “Robertson”). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banerjee in view of Robertson and in further in view of James et al. (US 2005/0198023, hereinafter “James”). Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banerjee in view of Robertson and in further view of Flaszka et al. (US 2003/0233340, hereinafter “Flaszka”). Claims 16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flaszka in view of Robertson. Claims 17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flaszka in view of Robertson and in further view of Banerjee.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 5-9

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Banerjee and Robertson. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Banerjee is not prior art with respect to the instant patent application which was filed on February 27, 2004. Banerjee was published internationally under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (as WO/2005/069159) on July 28,

2005. Banerjee was subsequently filed in the United States under 35 U.S.C. § 371(c)(1), (2), (4) on June 27, 2006 and published in the United States on July 5, 2007.

Banerjee fails to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because it is not an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent. As discussed above, the June 27, 2006 U.S. filing date of Banerjee is after the filing date of the instant application. Banerjee further fails to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) because it was not known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent. As discussed above, Banerjee was described in a printed PCT publication on July 28, 2005 which is after the filing date of the instant application. It is respectfully submitted that the remaining sections of 35 U.S.C. §102 under which Banerjee would potentially qualify as prior art are also inapplicable based on the current record.

As Banerjee is disqualified as prior art, it is further respectfully submitted that Robertson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 1-3 and 5-9. Robertson discusses a computer system for assisting users in locating and sharing information with other users by providing a user interface which users can establish contact relationships with other users. Robertson further discusses functionality for users to search the contacts of contacts of the respective user and the search may be limited in scope. See paragraph 0012.

Robertson however, fails to disclose a jump bar for assigning a character code to a button of the jump bar, wherein the character code is uniquely associated with an alphanumeric character of a character set having a single character code uniquely

associated with each alphanumeric character of a plurality of alphanumeric characters from a plurality of languages, as specified in claims 1-3 and 5-9. In contrast, Robertson is merely concerned with locating and sharing contact information in a computer system. Thus, Robertson is silent regarding assigning character codes as specified in claims 1-3 and 5-9. Based on the foregoing, claims 1-3 and 5-9 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Banerjee, Robertson, and James. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above, Banerjee is not prior art with respect to the instant patent application and Robertson is silent at least with respect to a jump bar for assigning a character code to a button of the jump bar, wherein the character code is uniquely associated with an alphanumeric character of a character set having a single character code uniquely associated with each alphanumeric character of a plurality of alphanumeric characters from a plurality of languages, which is also specified in claim 4.

It is respectfully submitted that Jones fails to cure the deficiencies of Robertson because James also fails to teach, disclose, or suggest a jump bar for assigning a character code to a button of the jump bar, wherein the character code is uniquely associated with an alphanumeric character of a character set having a single character code uniquely associated with each alphanumeric character of a plurality of alphanumeric characters from a plurality of languages, as specified in claim 4. James discusses the selection and ordering of one or more sets of linguistic objects for text disambiguation. James further

discusses the ordering of a first list of items in a first language and a second list of items in a second language and where the two lists of items are displayed in an order based on the first language having a priority over the second language or vice versa. See paragraph 0009.

As discussed above, James is merely concerned with the ordering of linguistic objects for disambiguating different languages. Therefore, James, like Robertson, is silent regarding assigning character codes as specified in claim 4 and thus the combination of James and Robertson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least this feature. Based on the foregoing, claim 4 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 10-15

Claims 10-15 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Banerjee, Robertson, and Flazsa. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10-15 specify similar features as independent claim 1, discussed above. As discussed above, Banerjee is not prior art with respect to the instant patent application and Robertson is silent at least with respect to wherein each button is associated uniquely with a character code corresponding to an alphanumeric character of a character set having a single character code uniquely associated with each alphanumeric character of a plurality of languages.

It is respectfully submitted that Flazsa fails to cure the deficiencies of Robertson because Flazsa also fails to teach, disclose, or suggest wherein each button is associated uniquely with a character code corresponding to an alphanumeric character of a character set having a single character code uniquely associated with each alphanumeric character

of a plurality of languages, as specified in claims 10-15. Flazsa discusses the ordering of character strings by determining which of two character strings has a lower collating weight according to a first dictionary sort order table with a non-unique collating sequence, and determining which of the two character strings has a lower collating weight according to a second dictionary sort order table with a unique collating sequence. See paragraph 0010. Flazsa also discusses multiple code points associated with a single alphabetic character. See Figures 1-3 (showing two code points each for the upper and lower case characters A-J).

As discussed above, Flazsa is merely concerned with the ordering of character strings using unique and non-unique collating sequences based on collating weights (e.g., upper and lower case characters may have different weights – see Flazsa, paragraph 0023). In contrast, Flazsa discusses two code points for an alphabetic character (see Figures 1-3) and thus fails to disclose at least a single character code uniquely associated with each alphanumeric character of a plurality of languages.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Robertson and Flazsa fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 10-15. Therefore, claims 10-15 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 18-20

Claims 16 and 18-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Flazsa in view of Robertson. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 16 has been amended to incorporate the features of canceled claim 17. As conceded in the Office Action, the combination of Flazsa and Robertson fails to specifically teach assigning weights based at least on the determined frequency

(See page 11, paragraph 6 in the Office Action). Therefore, amended claim 16 is allowable over Flazsa and Robertson for at least this reason. Moreover, amended claim 16 also specifies similar features as independent claim 10 discussed above. In particular, amended claim 16 specifies wherein each character code of the plurality of character codes uniquely corresponds in a one-to-one relationship to an alphanumeric character of a character set representing a plurality of alphanumeric characters of a plurality of languages. As discussed above, Flazsa discusses a two-to-one relationship for alphabetic characters with regard to code points (i.e., two code points for an alphabetic character - see Figures 1-3) and thus fails to disclose a character code uniquely corresponding in a one-to-one relationship to an alphanumeric character of a character set representing a plurality of alphanumeric characters of a plurality of languages. Robertson also fails to disclose this feature (see the discussion of Robertson above).

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Flazsa and Robertson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 16 and 18-20. Therefore, these claims are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 17 and 21

Claims 17 and 21 are rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Flazsa, Robertson, and Banerjee. Claim 17 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of this claim moot. The rejection of claim 21 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 depends from amended claim 16 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above Banerjee is not prior art with respect to the instant patent application. Furthermore, based on the above discussion of amended claim 16, it is

respectfully submitted that the combination of Flaszka and Robertson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 21 (at least by virtue of the dependency of claim 21 from amended claim 16). Moreover, as conceded in the Office Action, the combination of Flaszka and Robertson also fails to teach a Unicode character set. Thus, claim 21 is also allowable for at least this additional reason.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Flaszka and Robertson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 21. Therefore, claim 21 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

Date: December 16, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

